

PATENT

REMARKS

The Office Action dated January 20, 2006 has been received and considered. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested in view of the remarks provided below.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant notes with appreciation the indication at page 4 of the Office Action that claims 15-29 and 31 are allowed.

Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-14, and 32

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-9, 11-14, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Movshovich (U.S. 6,359,911). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1, from which claims 2-9 and 11-14 depend, recites "identifying a transport packet as containing audio stream data" and "comparing a value of a first field in the transport packet to a value of a first field register to determine a first outcome *in response to identifying the transport packet as containing audio stream data*." These elements are not disclosed or suggested by Movshovich.

Movshovich discloses a system having a PID match unit to locate transport packets with matching PIDs and forward the packets to a local header unit. *Movshovich*, col. 8, lines 28-30. The PID stores a PID table. *Id.*, col. 8, lines 42-43. According to Movshovich, "[t]he objective of the PID match unit 350 is to extract the PID information from the transport packets of the transport stream, for comparison with known PID table entries." *Id.*, col. 9, lines 17-19. Further,

Because the MPEG-2 transport stream can include a multiplex of audio/video programs, the MPEG transport demultiplexor 200 must determine which transport packets are part of the desired program in order to pass them on to the external MPEG decoders for further processing. The transport packets that are not part of the desired program can be discarded. *The PID match unit 304 makes the determination of which PIDs are part of the desired program.*

Id., col. 8, lines 18-26 (emphasis added). Thus, the comparison performed by the PID match unit is performed *on all incoming packets* in order to determine which PIDs are part of a desired program. The comparison performed by the PID is not based on *whether an incoming packet*

PATENT

contains audio stream data. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Movshovich of comparing a value of a first field in the transport packet to a value of a first field register to determine a first outcome *in response to identifying the transport packet as containing audio stream data*, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Movshovich does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

The Office Action states at pages 2 that Movshovich discloses that "PID data is used to determine whether the packet belongs to a particular program of interest....And the PID matching unit determines whether each of the individual packets belongs to the same program and whether they are of video or audio." However, even assuming *arguendo*, that Movshovich discloses these features, Movshovich does not disclose, and the Office Action makes no assertion that Movshovich discloses comparing a value of a first field in the transport packet to a value of a first field register to determine a first outcome *in response to identifying the transport packet as containing audio stream data*, as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-9 and 11-14 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Movshovich fails to disclose each and every element of these claims, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. In addition, these claims recite additional novel features.

With respect to claim 32, the claim recites claim recites "means for determining whether to enable audio stream data related to the transport packet to be received by a system or to discard the transport packet based at least in part on a comparison of a value of a first field in the transport packet to a value of a first field register, wherein the comparison is in response to identifying the transport packet as containing audio stream data." As explained above, Movshovich does not disclose any means for performing a comparison of a field in a transport packet *in response to identifying the transport packet as containing audio stream data*. Accordingly, Movshovich fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 32.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-9, 11-14, and 32 is improper. Withdrawal of this rejection and reconsideration of the claims therefore is respectfully requested.

PATENT

Obviousness Rejection of Claim 10

At page 5 of the Office Action, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Movshovich (US 6,329,911) in view of Van Steenbrugge (US 6,076,062). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 10 depends from claim 1. As explained above, Movshovich fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Accordingly Movshovich fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 10, at least by virtue of its dependence on claim 1. Further, Van Steenbrugge does not remedy the deficiency of Movshovich.


In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action fails to establish that Movshovich and Van Steenbrugge, individually or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claim 10. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claim 10 is improper. Withdrawal of this rejection and reconsideration of the claim therefore is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

8/20/06
Date


Adam D. Sheehan, Reg. No. 42,146,
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, L.L.P.
5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone) (512) 327-5452 (fax)